
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.: 5:24-cv-01332-JLS-MAR

Date: November 08, 2024

Title: Paris McGowan v. McLane Company, Inc., et al

Present: **HONORABLE JOSEPHINE L. STATON, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

Kelly Davis
Deputy Clerk

N/A
Court Reporter

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR PLAINTIFF:
Not Present

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR DEFENDANT:
Not Present

**PROCEEDINGS: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE
CONSOLIDATION**

This action was initiated in Los Angeles County Superior Court and removed to federal court on June 24, 2024. (*See* Notice of Removal, Doc. 1.) It has been associated as a related case with 2 other actions against McLane/Suneast, Inc., McLane Foodservice, Inc., and McLane Foodservice Distribution, Inc. (collectively, “Defendants”), which were both removed to federal court and transferred to this Court. Based on the Court’s review of the cases, these cases feature similar questions of law and fact, namely whether Defendants violated California’s wage-and-hour laws. (*See* Compl, Ex. A, Doc. 1.) Because of the common questions presented by these cases, consolidation seems appropriate.

As a result, Plaintiff is ORDERED to show cause why the following cases should not be consolidated:

- 2:23-cv-01220-JLS-MAR, *Fernando Prado v. McLane Suneast, Inc. et al*
- 5:24-cv-00689-JLS-MAR, *Paris McGowan v. McLane Company, Inc. et al*
- 5:24-cv-01332-JLS-MAR, *Paris McGowan v. McLane Company, Inc. et al*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No.: 5:24-cv-01332-JLS-MAR

Date: November 08, 2024

Title: Paris McGowan v. McLane Company, Inc., et al

The cases would all be consolidated under the low-number case, *Fernando Prado v. McLane Suneast, Inc. et al.* (2:23-cv-01220-JLS-MAR). All filings would be made in that action, which would bear the caption *Fernando Prado et al. v. McLane Suneast, Inc. et al.*

Plaintiff must respond, in writing, by November 22, 2024, explaining Plaintiff's position on consolidation. Defendants shall thereafter respond to Plaintiff's position, in writing, by December 6, 2024. No further briefing is allowed; responses shall not exceed ten pages.

Defendant McLane/Suneast, Inc.'s motion to dismiss and/or strike (Doc. 15), shall remain pending to allow the Court to resolve the question of case consolidation. Similarly, no scheduling conference will be set until after this question is resolved. If the cases are consolidated, the pending motion to dismiss will be denied as moot so that Defendant can file a single motion to dismiss under the new, consolidated case caption.

Initials of Deputy Clerk: kd